

1961

Approved For Release 1999/09/16 : CIA-RDP70-00058R000200130111-2

baseball as an art, demanding artistic performance at all times. His competitive spirit will stand as an inspiration and example to all players from the sandlot to the big leagues. I extend my sympathy to his immediate family—and the millions of members of his "baseball family," would have me add their word as well. Ty Cobb stayed on top during all his long baseball career; Ty Cobb will remain at the head of the list of America's sporting memorables.

### THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to say a word on the Senate floor with respect to the message which the President sent to Khrushchev on Berlin today, joined in the same tone by the French and the British. The event is portentous, and is of such concern to so many people, that I believe it is desirable to say a word about it in the Senate.

The message was blunt and serious. I support it fully. I believe it reflects the mood of the American people that we will not back down on the fundamentals with respect to Berlin. The message shows that we are ready to negotiate until the cows come home upon subjects which do not go to the preservation of the freedom of 2 million Berliners. Berlin as a symbol of freedom for the entire free world, or the right of self-determination, which is as basic a policy as we can have in all our activities throughout the world, whether it be in respect of the unification of Germany or the unification of Berlin.

No one wishes for a minute to take the position that we are shutting the door, that we are afraid to talk, that we do not want to talk, or that there are not things upon which we can agree which might represent some yielding of our position. What is not negotiable is pushing the United States, Great Britain, and France out of Berlin or making it some kind of hybrid free city, or in some other way gobbling it up for communism. Our President has so said, and I think the people will back him.

Madam President, the policy is not without risk. No great policy is without risk. The signal to give up Berlin would be clear evidence to all of Europe that we would not oppose the Communists having a free hand. Such a course would be unthinkable to us or to our allies throughout the world. This is the one position, if there is one position, on which we must stand. It is Berlin. I think that our President has undertaken a most sober responsibility. He made the statement clearly, bluntly, and seriously, and he is entitled to know from people who also have something to lose, like those of us in this Chamber, that he has our support, and that we agree with him that his action represents the serious mood of the American people on this issue.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

### CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, this morning the newspapers carried the good news that the distinguished American, Chester Bowles, is to remain as Under Secretary of State. I rise to congratulate the President on having made the decision that Mr. Bowles will continue to represent his country in the future with that same high level of ability with which he has represented it in the past.

In my judgment, the President has wisely beaten back the effort to assassinate by newspaper this fine public servant. Faceless men who anonymously spread vicious and largely untrue attacks on Mr. Bowles' ability and usefulness have been denied their target. A fine public servant having these special qualities, so badly needed to reorganize the State Department, so as to enable the Department to perform these critical duties in a rapidly changing world, will continue at his post.

Again I congratulate the President for his sound decision.

Madam President, many of us in public life have suffered the ordeal of newspaper. We are used to it. We take it in our stride. Our skins are thick. We do not resent it. The Bowles incident over the last 48 hours is merely one of many efforts made by little men without political courage to destroy valued public servants through their contacts with newspapermen. I have no criticism of the reporters who wrote the stories. This is their job. My criticism is of those men—and I again use the phrase faceless men, because they do not have the courage to identify themselves—who snipe in the dark against men of Mr. Bowles' stature.

I should like briefly to review a few of the newspaper accounts and to comment on some of the rumors and sessions—never proved—which have been made against this fine American and, incidentally, this distinguished Democrat.

On Monday, July 17, the New York Times carried an article on its front page entitled "Kennedy Expected To Ask Bowles To Resign Today." Unlike most New York Times articles, this one does not carry a byline. I do not know who wrote it. However, whoever did must have a very red face indeed this morning, because in that article it was stated, among other things, that "there is a major conflict of personality and policy developing here between the White House and Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut and U.S. Ambassador to India."

If there was such a conflict, it did not last very long, because as of this morning it is all over. The President, after having had a friendly lunch with Mr. Bowles, directed Mr. Salinger, his press secretary, to announce that Mr. Bowles would continue in his position, would make his trip to the Far East, as he intended, and was to stay in his job.

Nevertheless, the New York Times, 24 hours earlier had made the definite statement, based on someone's authority—I wonder whose authority—that the President was about to ask Mr. Bowles to resign. "The Times said it was under-

stood that this was to take place. The article states:

There is reason to believe that the President will ask Mr. Bowles to resign and accept an ambassadorship in Latin America.

I wonder who understood it. I wonder who planted that story. In the Senate we are accustomed to planted stories. This occurs to me to be a peculiarly inept effort to plant something, which turned out to be not true. The article states that Mr. Bowles' "primary interest lies in the field; not of administration, but of policy."

That is not true. When Mr. Bowles accepted the position of Under Secretary of State early this year he advised the President that his interest was due to the fact that he would be the principal administrator in the Department and would have an opportunity in that position to clean out the deadwood, to get rid of the older and more conservative rightwing permanent Foreign Service officers who were committed to the sterile policies in the world which got us into such trouble during the Eisenhower administration.

The article goes on to say that Mr. Bowles is being criticized in certain circles within the Department and in the White House for his position on Cuba. His position on Cuba was right. I have no doubt that this was one of the motivating causes which persuaded the President to reject this effort to assassinate Mr. Bowles' usefulness, and to keep him in his position.

Mr. Bowles—

Says the article—

has not argued for the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, or for the recognition of that regime, but has insisted that the opinion of the allied world demanded that this question be faced and debated vigorously within the Kennedy administration.

What is wrong with that? One of our best allies in Asia, Pakistan, recently sent its president over here. He visited us and he has just now left us. President Mohammad Ayub Khan has taken the same view on Communist China. On the "Meet the Press" program last Sunday he said in no uncertain terms that this was a matter on which the United States should make up its mind as to what it is going to do. In our country we make up our minds as the result of vigorous debate, not by pushing matters under the rug, as is done in totalitarian countries.

The article states that Mr. Bowles' position in wanting to reopen the China policy "has not endeared him to powerful Senators on Capitol Hill."

I wonder who they are. They have never been identified, and they certainly have not made their position clear on the floor of the Senate since Mr. Bowles took office in January.

The article states:

One other factor has envenomed Mr. Bowles' relations with the party.

He has been so harsh as to recommend ambassadors who are not in the tradition of being either permanent Foreign Service officers or political hacks. This